



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

fr  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/470,284	12/22/1999	SCOTT PATRICK CAMPBELL	08305/062001	5973
7590	02/08/2006		EXAMINER	
Micron Technology, Inc. C/o Tom D'Amico Dickstein, Shapiro, Moran & Oshinsky 2101 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037-1526				SELBY, GEVELL V
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2615		

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/470,284	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CAMPBELL, SCOTT PATRICK
	<b>Examiner</b> Gevell Selby	<b>Art Unit</b> 2615

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See the attached Response to Arguments.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

DAVID OMETZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/18/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant submits the prior art does not disclose the following limitations of the claimed invention:
  - 1) "a mounting structure extending from an upper surface of the plate and adapted to secure a prefabricated lens system to the plate above the lensing structure" as claimed in claims 1 and 26;
  - 2) "securing a mounting structure to an upper surface of the plate, said mounting structure being adapted to connect a prefabricated lens system to the plate above the lensing structure" as claimed in claims 28 and 52.
  - 3) there is nothing unclear about the limitation recited in claims 62 and 63. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

**Examiner's Reply:**

Re claims 1, 26, 28 and 52) The Beaman reference discloses a cover for an image sensor array and method of making an image sensor array having a cover plate comprising: a mounting structure (see figure 6, element 60: The lens elements (62) are held a prefabricated lens structure combined with the assembly (40) attached to the glass cover (25); it shown in the diagram that there is a mounting structure holding the lenses and filters in a linear fashion above the glass cover) extending from an upper surface of the plate (25) and adapted to secure a prefabricated lens system (62) to the plate. The plate (54) of the Bauer reference discloses the plurality of surfaces forming a lens structure. By combining the mounting structure of the Beaman reference onto the plate of the Bauer reference, the combination discloses a mounting structure extending

from an upper surface of the plate and adapted to secure a prefabricated lens system to the plate above the lensing structure.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to make such a combination in order to extend the range that the image sensor can photograph while maintaining a compact imaging system with low cost. By teaching to combine the mounting structure of the lens arrangement (62) with the assembly (40) to provide an arrangement that is smaller and has fewer interfaces does not teach away from securing the mounting structure to the plate, but rather, teaches to secure the plate, thus making the assembly even smaller with fewer interfaces. Figure 6 further discloses this feature. Therefore, the combination of Bauer in view of Beaman discloses all the claim limitations of claims 1-9, 11-17, 26, 28, 29, 31, and 52-56.

Re claims 62 and 63) Claims 62 and 63 provide for the use of "adapted to removably secure the prefabricated lens system", but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this

use is actually practiced. The claim does not set forth any sets involved in method/process of removably securing the prefabricated lens system to the plate.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gevell Selby whose telephone number is 571-272-7369. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 A.M. - 5:30 PM (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on 571-272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

gvs



DAVID OMETZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER